



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a second edition of the same brought out in 1607 by Luzi Papa, one of the bright lights of Early Rhaetian literature. A short introduction by Filip Saluz (commonly known as Philippus Gallizius, the Rhaetian Luther), a letter from Erasmus bearing upon the version, and an interesting preface by the author, touching the difficulties of translation into so unstable a language as his vernacular, serve to prepare the reader for the now free, now literal, and oftentimes peculiar rendition of the original. The author probably made use of Sebastian Castalion's Latin Bible, published at Bâle in 1556. In his annotations that follow each chapter we discover the zealous reformer, and those striking characteristics of mind which, as a jurist and theologian, naturally made him a special friend of Zwingli. The editor has given us here, as indicated above, the gospel according to St. Matthew and St. Mark only, and it was his intention that it should be a faithful reprint, but numerous misprints have crept into it, which were almost unavoidable in a work of this sort, and a list of them with the necessary corrections is, therefore, very properly added at the end of the volume. But besides these we find a series of text emendations, of which a part are superfluous, and another part out of place. If the original is faithfully reproduced, we have its list of corrections that are sufficient without adding them *de novo*, and the second class *gegen das original* might be worth considering as suggestions for textual criticism, but they injure the individuality of the work when they are thus introduced into the body of it and substituted for the primitive readings. The language itself of the translation represents that plastic stage of linguistic development that is so marked in the celebrated Musso-War epic, the author of which, Gian Travers, died only three years after the first edition of this New Testament version was published. At this time the Ladinian was considered, if not the oldest, certainly the purest dialect of the Rhaetian language, and hence graphic signs to represent its phonetic system were naturally invented here first and transmitted to the sister idioms, and the earliest printed works also in the Rhaetian were executed for this dialect species. The typographical workmanship of this volume is well done, and especially the various diacritical signs of the dialect are given with a precision that is highly creditable to the celebrated house that has published it.

A. M. ELLIOTT.

Studia Terentiana. SCR. AUG. GODFR. ENGELBRECHT. Vienna, 1883. 90 pp.

This interesting treatise is mainly concerned with a comparison of Plautus and Terence in respect to their use of forms. Many of the single points taken up have already been treated with more or less fulness, but nowhere have the differences been so skillfully grouped together or presented in so striking a light. Starting out with the uniform testimony of the ancients to the purity of Terence's diction, which was held to be quite worthy of a Scipio or a Laelius, the writer proceeds to show that very many vulgar and archaic forms used by Plautus were distinctly avoided by Terence, and that in not a few instances the critics have indiscreetly thrust into the text forms which were actually foreign to the later poet. Moreover, he is careful to point out that the difference between the two poets is one not simply of age, but of mental attitude. Terence was a conscious artist in words. He aimed to represent as far as was

possible, for the purposes of comedy, the language of the cultivated circle in which he moved. He avowedly lays claim to *pura oratio*. His standard in so far was higher than that of Plautus, and whatever may have been the loss in comic power, there is a distinct gain in urbanity. So Terence in many points seems to anticipate, as it were, the usage of Cicero, while his contemporaries, poets of coarser mould, keep closer to Plautus.

A summary of the results reached by the investigation is given on pp. 75-9. Of these we can only mention a few. Terence has no ablatives in *-d*, no genitives in *ai*, no nominative plurals of *-o* stems in *-is*, no futures of the third conjugation like *reddibo*. He avoids forms like *med*, *ted*, *mis*, *tis*, *ibus*, *hibus*, *danunt*, *homônis*, *similu*, *interibi*, *dehideo*, *præhideo*, *baetere* (despite Leo, Rheinisches Museum, XXXVIII, p. 24). Moreover, Engelbrecht disputes the right of the following forms to be considered as Terentian: *puere* (Fleckeisen, Eun. 624), *itere* (Bentley, Phorm. 566), *sortis* as nominative (Fleckeisen, And. 985), *isti* and *illi* as genitives (Brandt, Eun. 370, Phorm. 969, etc.), *sini* = *sivi* (Fleckeisen, And. 188), *earumpse* (Leo, Rheinisches Museum, XXXVIII 11), *poste* = *post* (Fleckeisen, And. 483). In many cases, forms which are constantly used by Plautus are very rarely used by Terence, sometimes only in particular formulas, or in certain places in the verse. It is an interesting observation (p. 54) that in the common form of curse, *di te perduint* (*perdant*), even in Plautus, the form in *-int* only occurs at the end of a verse, or of the first half of an iambic octonarius, while elsewhere *perdant* is regularly used. Hence, in Hec. 134 there is no need with Bentley and Fleckeisen to change *perduint* to *faxint*, since *perdant* satisfies both metre and the common usage. Plautus is much more free than Terence in his use of active forms of verbs usually deponent in the later language. On the other hand, strange as it may seem, the number of syncopated perfect forms like *dixti*, *intellexti*, *produxe*, is greater in the six plays of Terence than in the twenty plays of Plautus, and this syncopation must be set down as a characteristic of the *sermo urbanus* (*familiaris*), so that we need not be surprised to find it in the letters and orations of Cicero. Engelbrecht should have extended this comparison to other contract-forms like *decreverat* (And. 238), *norit*, *norat*, etc. Terence, for instance, has some forty contract-forms in the different tenses of *nosco*, while the certain examples in Plautus are comparatively few, as has been shown by Brix in his appendix to the edition of Trinummus, v. 1141. The adverbs in *-ter* like *firmiter*, of which Plautus has more than Terence, should have received some attention. In treating of *posthac*, it might not have been amiss to add a fact which hitherto seems to have escaped notice, that just as *antea*, which only occurs And. 52, is used at the end of the verse, so *postea* always occupies the same position, while in Plautus it is found most frequently, to be sure, at the end of a verse, but also at the beginning and within a verse.

In an appendix, Engelbrecht shows that in the use of the verb-forms in *-ris* and *-re*, while Plautus has thirty cases, in two hundred, of the fuller forms in *-ris*, Terence has fifty-six cases of forms in *-re* and none in *-ris*. The concluding sentence of the writer leads us to hope that we may sometime expect from him a discussion of the differences between Plautus and Terence in vocabulary, syntax and prosody. The materials for such a work are very rich, and a careful study of them cannot fail to elicit results both valuable and interesting.

M. WARREN.